

Chicago, IL 60606-6630

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF United States Patent and Trademark Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENT P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,018	06/24/2003	Joel K. Zupancic	1199 P 186	2586
7590 08/02/2004			EXAMINER	
Roger H. Stein, Esq.			GRAVINI, STEPHEN MICHAEL	
Wallenstein &	Wagner, Ltd.			
53rd Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
311 South Wacker Drive			3749	

DATE MAILED: 08/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

3		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/603,018	ZUPANCIC ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Stephen Gravini	3749
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	lears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address ;-
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was reply to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
<ul> <li>1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 Octobro</li> <li>2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.</li> <li>2b) ☑ This</li> <li>3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under Example 20 Octobro</li> </ul>	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	´ <del></del>	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20031020</u> .	5)  Notice of Informal F 6)  Other:	'atent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/603,018

Art Unit: 3749

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 6-10, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Motev et al. (US 5,239,613). Motev is considered to teach the claimed system and method comprising:

a power intensity selector **65** capable of being selected by a user or receiving a power intensity value to be supplied to the device (wherein the disclosed heating element controller is considered patentably equivalent to the claimed selector because both allow a user to select a power intensity);

transmitting the generated power intensity output signal to the device or an application module **79** capable of generating a power intensity output signal (wherein the disclosed program control is considered patentably equivalent to the claimed responsive power intensity selector application module interaction), the application module further comprising:

a calculation interval; and,

a base resolution amount wherein the power intensity output signal being determined in response to the selected power intensity, the base resolution amount, and the calculation interval or generating a power intensity output signal in response to the received power intensity (please see column 10 lines 44-65 wherein the disclosed control panel operation by the implied user selection is considered to anticipate the claimed calculation interval and base resolution interval); and

Application/Control Number: 10/603,018

Art Unit: 3749

a time cycle selector **89** providing a range of time duration for applying the power intensity output signal to the device or receiving a time cycle duration for applying the power intensity value to the device. Motev is also considered to disclose the claimed plurality of lamps **12** and infrared radiant panels at column 7 line 29).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 3-5 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motev. Motev is considered to disclose the claimed invention, as discussed above under the anticipatory rejection, except for the claimed frequency basis, frequency value, and resolution amount. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to recite a frequency basis, frequency value, and resolution amount, since the applicants have not discussed why those claim recitations would patentably distinguish the claimed

Application/Control Number: 10/603,018

Art Unit: 3749

invention over the frequency basis, frequency value, and resolution amount implied in the prior art.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motev in view of Kurachi (US 6,388,690). Motev is considered to disclose the claimed invention, as discussed above under the anticipatory rejection, except for the claimed lamp selection portion utilization. Kurachi is considered to disclose a feature of lamp selection portion utilization at column 5 line 54 through column 6 line 19. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Motev with the considered disclosed feature including lamp selection portion utilization for the purpose of providing an evenly applied power intensity selection for graphic printing precision.

### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. References A through B and D through F are considered to disclose a programmable power intensity application for graphic textile or paper design. Furthermore, it is considered that the invention, as broadly claimed, could be anticipated by any power application device or method involving a timed power application, such as a household toaster or domestic clothes dryer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Gravini whose telephone number is 703 308

Art Unit: 3749

7570. The examiner can normally be reached on normal weekday business hours (east coast time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ira S. Lazarus can be reached on 703 308 1935. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

smg

July 27, 2004

Steph M Gravini